

09 CA 10678 DPW

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

FILED
IN CLERKS OFFICE

APR 23 P 12:50

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASS.

PAUL L. MUCKLE,
Plaintiff

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Former President George W. Bush; President Barack H. Obama;

Treasury Secretaries John W. Snow, Henry Merritt Paulson, Jr., Tim Geithner;

SEC Chiefs William H. Donaldson, Christopher Cox;

The governors of the following states or their current successors

MAGISTRATE JUDGE Sorkin

AK	<u>Sara Palin</u>	MT	<u>Brian Schweitzer</u>
AL	<u>Robert Riley</u>	NC	<u>Michael Easley</u>
AR	<u>Mike Dale Beebe</u>	ND	<u>John Hoeven</u>
AZ	<u>Janet Napolitano</u>	NE	<u>Dave Heineman</u>
CA	<u>Arnold Schwarzenegger</u>	NH	<u>John Lynch</u>
CO	<u>Bill Ritter</u>	NJ	<u>John Corzine</u>
CT	<u>M. Jody Rell</u>	NM	<u>Bill Richardson</u>
DE	<u>Ruth Ann Minner</u>	NV	<u>Jim Gibbons</u>
FL	<u>Charles J. Crist, Jr.</u>	NY	<u>Eliot Spitzer</u>
GA	<u>Sonny Perdue</u>	OH	<u>Ted Strickland</u>
HI	<u>Linda Lingle</u>	OK	<u>Brad Henry</u>
IA	<u>Chet Culver</u>	OR	<u>Ted Kulongoski</u>
ID	<u>C.L. "Butch" Otter</u>	PA	<u>Edward Rendell</u>
IL	<u>Rod Blagojevich</u>	RI	<u>Don Carcieri</u>
IN	<u>Mitch Daniels</u>	SC	<u>Mark Sanford</u>
KS	<u>Kathleen Sebelius</u>	SD	<u>Mike Rounds</u>
KY	<u>Ernie Fletcher</u>	TN	<u>Phil Bredesen</u>
LA	<u>Kathleen Blanco</u>	TX	<u>Rick Perry</u>
MA	<u>Deval Patrick</u>	UT	<u>John Huntsman</u>
MD	<u>Martin O'Malley</u>	VA	<u>Tim Kaine</u>
ME	<u>John Baldacci</u>	VT	<u>Jim Douglas</u>
MI	<u>Jennifer Granholm</u>	WA	<u>Christine Gregoire</u>
MN	<u>Tim Pawlenty</u>	WI	<u>Jim Doyle</u>
MO	<u>Matt Blunt</u>	WV	<u>Joe Manchin, III</u>
MS	<u>Haley Barbour</u>	WY	<u>Dave Freudenthal</u>

Defendants

**CIVIL COMPLAINT FOR MORTGAGE FRAUD, VIOLATION OF THE
FEDERAL HOME OWNERSHIP & EQUITY PROTECTION ACT, VIOLATION
OF THE FEDERAL TRUTH IN LENDING ACT, VIOLATIONS OF THE
RESPECTIVE STATES' PREDATORY LENDING LAWS, AND VIOLATION OF
SECTION 1 AND SECTION 4 OF THE 14TH AMENDMENT OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

CIVIL CHARGES

1. Paul L. Muckle, pro se, the plaintiff in the above entitled action, respectfully files this complaint against the named defendants, accusing them jointly and severally of violating the follows laws:
 - a. Section 1 of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution.
 - b. Section 4 of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution.
 - c. The Federal Home Ownership and Equity Protection Act of 1994, as amended, HOEPA. 15 U.S.C. ss. 1639, 12 C.F.R. ss.ss. 226.32 and 226.34
 - d. The Arkansas Home Loan Protection Act, Ark. Code Ann. ss.ss. High Cost Home Loan 23-53-101 et seq.
 - e. The Cleveland Heights, OH Ordinance No. 72-2003 (PSH), Mun. Code ss.ss. 757.01 et Covered Loan seq.
 - f. The Colorado Consumer Equity Protection, Colo. Stat. Ann. ss.ss. Covered Loan 5-3.5-101 et seq.
 - g. The Connecticut Abusive Home Loan Lending Practices Act, High Cost Home Loan Conn. Gen. Stat. ss.ss. 36a-746 et seq.
 - h. The District of Columbia Home Loan Protection Act, D.C. Code ss.ss. 26-1151.01 et seq. Covered Loan

- i. The Florida Fair Lending Act, Fla. Stat. Ann. ss.ss. 494.0078 et seq. High Cost Home Loan
- j. The Georgia Fair Lending Act, Ga. Code Ann. ss.ss. 7-6A-1 et seq. High Cost Home Loan 6, 2003) et seq. Georgia as amended (Mar. 7, Georgia Fair Lending Act, Ga. Code Ann. ss.ss. 7-6A-1 et seq. High Cost Home Loan 2003 - current)
- k. The Illinois High Risk Home Loan Act, Ill. Comp. Stat. tit. 815, High Risk Home Loan ss.ss. 137/5 et seq.
- l. The Indiana Home Loan Practices Act, Ind. Code Ann. ss.ss. High Cost Home Loan. 24-9-1-1 et seq.
- m. The Kansas Consumer Credit Code, Kan. Stat. Ann. ss.ss. 16a-1-101 High Loan to Value Consumer Loan (id. et seq. ss. 16a-3-207), and Sections 16a-1-301 and 16a-3-207 became effective High APR Consumer Loan (id. ss. Section 16a-3-308a became effective 16a-3-308a)
- n. The Kentucky 2003 KY H.B. 287 - High Cost Home Loan Act, Ky. Rev. High Cost Home Loan Stat. ss.ss. 360.100 et seq.
- o. The Maine Truth in Lending, Me. Rev. Stat. tit. 9-A, ss.ss. 8-101. High Rate High Fee Mortgage et seq.
- p. The Massachusetts Part 40 and Part 32, 209 C.M.R. ss.ss. 32.00 et seq. and High Cost Home Loan 209 C.M.R. ss.ss. 40.01 et seq. Massachusetts Predatory Home Loan Practices Act High Cost Home Mortgage Loan Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 183C, ss.ss. 1 et seq.

- q. The Nevada Assembly Bill No. 284, Nev. Rev. Stat. ss.ss. 598D.010 Home Loan et seq.
- r. The New Jersey New Jersey Home Ownership Security Act of 2002, N.J. High Cost Home Loan. Rev. Stat. ss.ss. 46:10B-22 et seq.
- s. The New Mexico Home Loan Protection Act, N.M. Rev. Stat. ss.ss. High Cost Home Loan 58-21A-1 et seq.
- t. The New York N.Y. Banking Law Article 6-1, High Cost Home Loan
- u. The North Carolina Restrictions and Limitations on High Cost Home High Cost Home Loan Loans, N.C. Gen. Stat. ss.ss. 24-1.1E et seq.
- v. The Ohio H.B. 386 (codified in various sections of the Ohio Covered Loan Code), Ohio Rev. Code Ann. ss.ss. 1349.25 et seq.
- w. The Oklahoma Consumer Credit Code (codified in various sections Subsection 10 Mortgage of Title 14A)
- x. The South Carolina South Carolina High Cost and Consumer Home Loans High Cost Home Loan Act, S.C. Code Ann. ss.ss. 37-23-10 et seq.
- y. The West Virginia Residential Mortgage Lender, Broker West Virginia Mortgage Loan Act Loan and Servicer Act, W. Va. Code Ann. ss.ss. 31-17-1 et seq.

2. The complaint also accuses the defendants of:

- a. Failure to protect the residents in each respective state and of every state in the Union from unlawful dispossession and financial rip-off.

- b. Aiding and abetting in the dispossession of the residents of each respective state.
- c. Failure to protect the national and financial security of the people of the United States of America.

DEMANDS

- 3. This complaint does not seek monetary damages.
- 4. The complaint seeks "CEASE AND DESIST ORDERS" against all the defendants, jointly and severally, to:
 - a. Cease and desist from granting any foreclosure ORDER that violates the "Due Process" clause of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution.
 - b. Cease and desist from violating the "Equal Protect" clause of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution.
 - c. Cease and desist from granting any foreclosure ORDERS that, under the federal HOEPA and each respective state's predatory lending laws are, "unconscionable and void."
 - d. Cease and Desist from violating Section 4 of the 14th Amendment by paying the debt, through federal bailouts, of foreign and domestic investment firms which were responsible for the fraud that's destroying the United States' economy.

- e. The complaint states in no uncertain terms that all subprime loans in the country with adjustable rate interest have "Fraud in the Factum" in the origination of the promissory note. Therefore, under the Uniform Commercial Code Section 3-305, all such notes are null and void.
- f. The complaint seeks that after seeing the evidence, the Court must move to confiscate the deeds to an estimated 10 million subprime home mortgages in the entire United States of America from the foreign note owners and to transfer said deeds to the care and protection of the United States Treasury.
- g. The complaint also seeks that the Court order the United States Treasury to take immediate steps to go after all financial institutions which were actively involved in the gross mortgage and securities fraud that's wreaking havoc on the livelihood of the people, and the firms which got taxpayer's bailout money, and to demand that the bailout money they received be returned to the Treasury of the United States, forthwith, or face confiscation also.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

- 5. The plaintiff respectfully files this complaint on the grounds of Sovereign Citizenship.
- 6. All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein

they reside. The plaintiff is a legal derivative citizen of the United States of America and a resident of the state of Massachusetts.

7. Sovereign Citizenship is the birthright of all Americans, who in turn extended this most important right to foreign-born persons through naturalization laws. With this status, my unalienable rights of life, liberty and property couldn't be infringed upon nor could they be transferred or sold by any other person.
8. The plaintiff's claims of sovereign citizenship, which is a right vested in him by the United States Declaration of Independence to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, is absolute.
9. Each individual, at least so far as respects his unalienable rights, is his own sovereign, which means that wherever the rights of the people as a whole are being abridged, then any citizen is free to pursue claims on behalf of himself and the collective citizens of his state and of every state in the Union, in any federal court of law, against any enemy or entity, whether foreign or domestic, jointly and severally, to redress the violation of any law or the enforcement of any law which directly threatens his sovereign rights; whether that violation occurs in his respective state and/or in any other state in the Union. So long as it affects me as a sovereign, I have a right to sue.
10. "The word "sovereign" is defined in the sixth edition of Black's Law Dictionary, published in 1990, as being "A person, body, or state in which independent authority is vested; a chief ruler with supreme power; a king or other ruler in a monarchy." Prior to the War for American Independence, the British king was

the sovereign and the American people were his subjects. The war's outcome changed all this; let us not go back down that road.

11. The sovereignty has been transferred from one man to the collective body of the people, and he who before was a subject of the king is now a citizen of the State. *State v. Manuel*, North Carolina, Vol. 20, Page 121 (1838)
12. Thus, a citizen of a state is, by the federal Constitution, made a citizen of the United States. This means the following: A citizen of one state is to be considered as a citizen of every other state in the Union. *Butler v. Farnsworth*, Federal Cases, Vol. 4, Page 902 (1821)
13. Therefore, if any citizen of any state has evidence that any entity, whether foreign or domestic, is engaged in any adverse action which abridges the rights of the people, or that causes destruction to our nation's economy, then that citizen, as a sovereign, has the constitutional right and the patriotic duty to his country to intervene to stop it; whether through an act of war or through a court of law.
14. For purpose of elimination (because I know this will be the first line of defense for the court and the defendants), the Federal Court, Local Rule 83.5.3 (c), which states that a non attorney cannot act as the lawyer for anyone but himself, is a direct violation of my 14th Amendment rights. Let us explore this concept by focusing on "what are considered as being the rights inherent in citizenship in America: When men entered into a state, they yielded a part of their absolute rights, or natural liberty, for political or civil liberty, which is no

other than natural liberty restrained by human laws, so far as is necessary and expedient for the general advantage of the public.” What this is clearly stating is that unless the action that I am taking adversely impacts or infringes upon the sovereign rights of another citizen in the Union, or unless my actions adversely threatens the public interest, then no court in the land has the right to deny my claim on the grounds of a local rule.

15. Federal Local Rule 83.5.3 (c) is a direct infringement of my constitutional right and duty to defend my country and my fellow citizens from a “clear and present danger” to our financial stability and to our national security.
16. My absolute sovereign rights to defend my country and my people in a federal court of law is an advantage, not a disadvantage, to the public, nor does it infringe on the rights of any other citizens if the citizens are being grossly harmed by the action for which I, as a sovereign citizen, seek to redress.
17. In America it is unlawful to kill, but if I had information that a group of terrorists, whether foreign or domestic, were plotting to harm the people, or to bring harm to the government of the United States of America, and I was to kill those terrorists, would they not pin labels on my shoulder and parade me across the airwaves? So then why is it that if I perform the same act, nonviolently, but in a civil action in a court of law, why do they say I have no standing to do so, and that I cannot defend anyone else?
18. This lawsuit does not seek monetary damages nor does the plaintiff require any compensation for any service rendered in this lawsuit. A license for the

right to practice law is an agreement to share the loot, e.g., "Collective Security for Surety." For what will they tax me if I loot no man? So then why do I need a license to defend? This lawsuit simply seeks a CEASE AND DESIST ORDER against thievery and dispossession, and to seek the protection of our national security, and to protect the integrity of the overall U.S. economy. The defendants should be my co-plaintiffs.

19. It is for the benefit of all the people that I, as a sovereign citizen, wage this civil war against the foreign investment firms destroying our economy and threatening our national security from within.
20. For two years now, I have been trying to bring what I know to the attention of the appropriate authorities, but the authorities have been derelict in their duty to the people; therefore, under the U.S. Constitution, if the government ceases to function effectively on behalf of the citizens, then I as a sovereign citizen have a patriotic duty to my country to wage war against any enemy of the people, whether that enemy be foreign or domestic.
21. You may consider this civil action an act of war on behalf of me and of all the people. Because the government won't go after the financial terrorists who are terrorizing the people and destroying our country from within, then I must sue the government to force them into action. Therefore, this action against the government is not an act of malfeasance, but rather a war of attrition (what I call my Jericho Wall Strategy). If the royals won't come down from off the

mountain, then I as a sovereign have no problem going up there to fetch them down.

22. We are a nation of laws. Any action to dismiss this complaint on the grounds of any Local Rule is an abridgement of my sovereign rights to liberty. Any enforcement of any Local Rule 83.5.3 (c) in this instant case is a violation of the 14th Amendment which states, "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States of America." The federal government is NOT excluded, or immune from this provision of the Constitution. Just thought that I would save myself the two trips to the Appellate Courts.

COMPLAINT

23. Between the year 2006, to the present year 2009, more than three million American families throughout all 50 states in the Union, have lost their homes through a foreclosure epidemic caused my mortgage and securities fraud perpetrated by foreign and domestic investments firms on Wall Street.

24. The above named defendants have all admitted that because of mortgage fraud perpetrated by investment bankers on Wall Street and the home mortgage industry, they are expecting many more (at least another seven million or so) American Family homes to be lost to foreclosure.

25. However, despite this foreknowledge, the defendants as protectors of their people, have failed to take the appropriate action in stopping this unlawful

dispossession and robbery of the people, but has instead engaged in acts which not only aid and abet the perpetrators, but which violate the 14th Amendment to the Constitutional of the United States of America and the federal and states' Predatory Lending Acts as mentioned in paragraph one of this complaint.

26. Under the terms of each individual mortgage contract originated in all 50 states in the United States of America within the last 5 years, the drafter of the contract (the mortgage lender) has inserted a provision which states words to this effect: 'In the case of default on the mortgage terms, if the citizen does not cure the default within the prescribed time, the lender may use the applicable law to foreclose on the consumer's property and sell it, without further notice to consumer.'
27. Under this clause in the mortgage contract, American mortgage note holders, doing the tasks of their foreign bosses on Wall Street, are permitted by state law to walk into an American Court of Law (such as the housing court), and file an ex parte complaint to obtain, without any objection and/or knowing and intelligent assent thereof, "legal rights" to enter into, and to take possession of property, and to evict that America citizen out into the street like a dog, and to sell his/her property without first granting that citizen his/her constitutional rights to due process; these due process rights being the rights to contest the validity and/or fairness of the dispossession.

28. Under the terms of the mortgage contract, the consumer has no legal rights to contest the foreclosure of his/her property in the very same proceeding as the lender is allowed to go and argue for the rights to dispossess.
29. This complaint states, not alleges, that all four million-plus foreclosure orders which have been issued in any ex parte hearing in any American court of law throughout any of the 50 states within the past five years, are all unlawful and violate the due process rights of the citizens who are directly affected by said foreclosures.
30. Under federal consumer protection ordinance, each individual state must enact anti-predatory lending laws which must exceed or conform to the federal Home Ownership & Equity Protection Act (HOEPA) unless that state chooses to adopt the federal standards.
31. The federal Home Ownership and Equity Protection Act was enacted to fight predatory lending and equity stealing by unscrupulous lenders. One of the issues that the HOEPA dealt with was the slick way in which lenders were able to use the system to legally cheat unsuspecting homeowners out of their homes.
32. Under Regulation Z of HOEPA and each individual state's anti-predatory lending laws, one of the practices that falls within the definition of predatory lending happens when a lender hides words in the fine print that make it illegal for the homeowner to take legal action against the lender. The borrowers sign away their rights to sue the lender for any fraud, predatory

actions or illegal actions. The only right the borrowers have is to take their grievances to arbitration. The arbitration process is totally in the hands of the lenders, usually conducted in secret without the borrowers having adequate representation. Although the borrowers can usually have legal counsel, they find it difficult to find anyone who will represent them because the lawyers are not guaranteed payment of their fees in arbitration like they are in court. Many arbitration cases are handled over the phone and when a small individual is pitted against a large corporation and the proceedings are confidential with no stenographic or written record of the facts, the borrower is at a true disadvantage. Most arbitration decisions are binding and the borrowers cannot appeal them.

33. Each individual state's predatory lending law which is modeled after the federal HOEPA, specifically using the language of the Massachusetts General Laws 183C §13, states, "Without regard to whether a borrower is acting individually or on behalf of others similarly situated, any provision of a high cost home mortgage loan that allows a party to require a borrower to assert any claim or defense in a forum that is less convenient, more costly, or more dilatory for the resolution of a dispute than a judicial forum established in the commonwealth where the borrower may otherwise properly bring a claim or defense or limits in any way any claim or defense the borrower may have is unconscionable and void."

34. Section 1 of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution states, “No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law.”
35. However, despite this forbiddance by the United States Constitution and the federal and state predatory lending laws, lenders are still permitted to deprive the people of their pursuit of liberty and property. Let’s analyze the situation: The law already recognized that arbitration strips consumers of their rights, in fact this is how the law puts it: (a) “The arbitration process is totally in the hands of the lenders, (b) usually conducted in secret without the borrowers having adequate representation. (c) Proceedings are confidential. (d) Most arbitration decisions are binding and the borrowers cannot appeal them.
36. Now, with those recognitions by the government in mind, how is a foreign note holder allowed to walk into an American court of law, by themselves, without any notice to the citizen, and seek an American court order from an American judge empowered by an American state governor, for the dispossession of a citizen?
37. Am I the only one who sees that the lenders got slicker and bolder? Instead of forcing the citizen into arbitration to contest the foreclosure, the lender eliminated the whole process altogether. Instead of granting the citizen the right to dispute the validity of the foreclosure, the lender just goes straight to a

court of law, and demands that the American judge give them the legal rights to dispossess the people, without the people being able to tell their side of the story. The only time the citizen knows that they are being deprived of their property and their rights to due process, is when they receive their copy of that American court order granting legal rights to dispossession. By then it is already too late; the one-sided legal order has already been issued, the matter has already been recorded in the County's Registry of Deeds, and the notice of sale has already been placed in the local newspaper. The only thing that's left is for prospective buyers to come and begin the Great Humiliation. What a calamity! There is no appellate process, except that the citizen now has to hire an attorney and file a separate suit which in the end would be even more costly than arbitration.

38. What attorney will take a case where the foreclose order has already been issued? And on what grounds would he sue? Wasn't the Dispossession Order issued by a court of law established in the commonwealth or state, by that state's government? Had I not been too ignorant to accept defeat, I too would have been amongst the victims of this Great Disrespect.

39. But to add insult to injury, the foreclosure ORDERS that are signed by the Chief Justice of the housing court states, "If you are entitled to the benefits of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act as amended and you object to such foreclosure you or your attorney should file a written appearance and answer

in said court ...or you may be forever barred from claiming that said foreclosure is invalid under said act.” (See Exhibit A.)

40. So right there, in plain English, if the homeowner is not a member of the military on active duty, then that homeowner is not entitled to contest the validity of the foreclosure. This is a blatant violation of the ‘equal protection’ clause of the 14th Amendment.

Exhibit A

(SEAL)

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
LAND COURT
DEPARTMENT OF THE TRIAL COURT

65523
Received & Recorded
PLYMOUTH COUNTY
REGISTRY OF DEEDS
28 JUN 2007 10:42AM
JOHN R. BUCKLEY, JR.
REGISTER
Bk 34737 Pg 112

To:

Case No. 343126

Irene Wood; Paul L. Mucke

and to all persons entitled to the benefit of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

U.S. Bank National Association as Trustee for SG Mortgage Securities Asset Backed Certificates, Series 2006-FRE2

claiming to be the holder of a Mortgage property in Brockton,
covering real numbered 35 Newbury Street

given by Irene Wood to Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc., dated May 5, 2005, and recorded with the Plymouth County Registry of Deeds at Book 32639, Page 106 and now held by the plaintiff by assignment

has filed with said court a complaint for authority to foreclose said mortgage

in the manner following: by entry and possession and exercise of power of sale.

If you are entitled to the benefits of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act as amended and you object to such foreclosure you or your attorney should file a written appearance and answer in said court at Boston on or before the 9th day of July 2007.

or you may be forever barred from claiming that such foreclosure under said act.

is invalid

Witness, KARYN F. SCHEIER, Chief Justice of said Court this

5th day of June 2007.
Attest:

A TRUE COPY
ATTEST:

200703-0757

Deborah J. Patterson
RECORDER

DEBORAH J. PATTERSON
RECORDER

The foregoing is a true copy from the
Plymouth County Registry of Deeds.
Book 34737 Page 112
Attest: John R. Buckley Jr.
Register

HARMON LAW OFFICES, P.C.
180 CALIFORNIA ST.
NEWTON, MA 02458

41. There are parallels between what the lenders did before the predatory lending acts were enacted, and what they are doing after those laws were enacted, and they got even bolder. They eliminated the citizen's rights to contest the foreclosure altogether and just walk into court boldly, without notice, and demand legal rights to deprive a citizen of their most sacred rights to property without due process.
42. The people aren't even allowed to assert any defense because according to the ORDER written by the court and signed by the American judge, they have no such rights unless they are entitled to the Servicemen's Civil Relief Act.
43. The rights to foreclose order granted by the court which allow only military servicemen the right to contest the validity of a foreclosure is a blatant violation of the 'equal protection' clause of the 14th Amendment.
44. Should I keep back my opinion at such a time, through fear of giving offense or on the penalties of death? No; I should consider myself guilty of treason towards the people, and an act of disloyalty to the Majesty of Heaven who I revere above all earthy kings.
45. Didn't most of the defendants oppose the war for which the Servicemen's Civil Relief Act was amended? What is the difference between the soldier fighting in a war far away from the home front, the policeman fighting crime in our streets, the carpenter beautifying his neighborhood, or the garbage collector keeping our cities sanitary? Aren't we all serving the United States of America? Am I the only who saw the trick? While our attention was focused on the warfront *over there*, they snuck their Trojan horse in through the back door *over here*. Isn't that the true concept of open warfare? You distract the

enemy by keeping him focused on other things while you sneak in the back door and destroy the civilians within. It's not about the soldiers; war has never been, nor will it ever be about fighting the soldiers. A soldier will pick up arms in a heartbeat to defend the family, but kill the family and the soldier will lay down his arms. I mean, what more does he have to fight for? Ever since 9/11, the goal has been to destroy the American family. Which country can bring America to its knees militarily? But you destroy the family base, and America would crumble like a deck of cards. We got drawn into a false war which no one can ever win. But the real war was never about bombs and bullets; it was always about destroying the family and enslaving them through economics. Dead people can't spend money. The World Trade Center? Two times? It is all about trade. While we're on fool's errands overseas, the family is being destroyed at home. These subprime loans are the ultimate Trojan Horse. The war was all one big distraction; all part of the big scheme. Even the bailouts were planned.

46. Which American note holder got to keep the billions of bailout money they got?

Let's tell the people the truth as to who really got the money. The American banks were not losing money because they were not funding the loans. The foreign investment firms were funding the loans; the American banks would originate the loans then transfer the title over to the foreign investor. Therefore, it is the foreign investor who suffers the loss, and so when they give bailouts the American banks hand the taxpayers' money right over to their